

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/753,912

Applicant(s)

Lakes

Office Action Summary

Examiner Daniel G. DePumpo

Art Unit 3611

	The MA	AILING DATE of this c	ommunication appears	on the cover	sheet with the	e correspondence address	
THE M - Extens afte - If the be If NO con - Failure - Any re	ORTENED IAILING [sions of tine or SIX (6) I period for considered period for nmunicatio o to reply v eply receive	DATE OF THIS COMING may be available und MONTHS from the mailing reply specified above is a timely. Teply is specified above, on. Within the set or extended.	er the provisions of 37 C ng date of this communic less than thirty (30) days the maximum statutory of period for reply will, by an three months after the	FR 1.136 (a). ation. , a reply withi period will app	In no event, ho n the statutory r oly and will expire the application	MONTH(S) FROM wever, may a reply be timely to minimum of thirty (30) days we re SIX (6) MONTHS from the re in to become ABANDONED (35) ication, even if timely filed, ma	ill nailing date of this 5 U.S.C. § 133).
	Responsi	ve to communication	n(s) filed on <i>Jan 3, 20</i>	001 5	•••		···
2a) 🗌	This action	on is FINAL .	2b) 💢 This act	tion is non-fi	nal.		
Dispositi	closed in ion of Cla	accordance with the aims	practice under <i>Ex pa</i>	rte Quayle,	1935 C.D. 11		
4) 💢	Claim(s)	1-32		\$10 L 415		_ is/are pending in the app	lication.
4	a) Of the	above, claim(s)	• •		, ,e 1 .	_ is/are withdrawn from o	consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)			, * ,	· · · ·	is/are allowed.	
6) 🗆	Claim(s)		<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are rejected.	
7) 🗆	Claim(s)				· · · ·	is/are objected to.	
8) 💢	Claims <u>1</u>	-32			are subject to	restriction and/or election	n requirement.
Applicat	ion Pape The spec	rs ification is objected	to by the Examiner.	abjected to	by the Even	inor	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner. 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.							
_			ected to by the Exam		-	iloved by disapproved.	
Priority i	under 35 Acknowl	U.S.C. § 119 edgement is made o	f à claim for fóreign p	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ţ	119(a)-(d).	
1			riority documents hav	ve been rece	ived.		
2			riority documents hav			ation No.	
		application from	opies of the priority d the International Bure action for a list of th	au (PCT _. Rul	e 17.2(a)).	rived in this National Stage rived.	÷
14)	Acknowl	edgement is made o	f a claim for domestic	priority und	ler 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e).	
Attachment(s)							
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)				18) intervie	w Summary (PTO-4	13) Paper No(s)	
16) Not	tice of Drafts	person's Patent Drawing Revie	: . w (PTO-948)			pplication (PTO-152)	
17) 🔲 Info	ormation Disc	closure Statement(s) (PTO-144	9) Paper Nois).	20) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/753,912 Page 2

Art Unit: 3611

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the

claimed invention:

I. fig. 3

II fig. 7.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 3611

2. A telephone call was made to Michael Milz on December 4, 2001 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel G. DePumpo whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

DANIEL G. DePUMPO PRIMARY EXAMINER

dgd

December 4, 2001